

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 36, and 40-56 have been canceled, with traverse, pursuant to a restriction election and Applicant reserves the right to assert these claims in any future divisional, continuation, or continuation-in-part applications.

Claims 57-58 have been added.

The Examiner's requirement for restriction divided the application into ten (10) inventions as follows:

- I. Claims 1-5 and 40-44, drawn to Airport System, classified in class 105, subclass 10.
- II. Claims 6-13, drawn to Aircraft, classified in class 244, subclass 120.
- III. Claims 14-23, drawn to Airport Terminal, classified in class 705, subclass 10.
- IV. Claims 24-34, drawn to Passenger Compartment, classified in class 244, subclass 120.
- V. Claims 35-39, drawn to Passenger Compartment, classified in class 244, subclass 120.
- VI. Claims 45-46, drawn to Landing Gear for Airplane, classified in class 244, subclass 100R.
- VII. Claims 47-49, drawn to Method for Purchasing Tickets, classified in class 705, subclass 27.
- VIII. Claim 50, drawn to Method for Airport Layout, classified in class 244, subclass 137.2.
- IX. Claims 51-54, drawn to Method for Loading Container, classified in class 209, subclass 559.
- X. Claims 55-56, drawn to Method for Marketing on Aircraft, classified in class 705, subclass 10.

Applicant respectfully elects, with traverse, the prosecution of Claims 24-34 for Invention IV as identified by the Examiner.

Applicant has amended Claim 35 to depend from Claim 24 and as such respectfully submits that Claims 35 and 37-39 should now be grouped with what the Examiner has identified as Invention IV and should be examined therewith. Further, Applicant has added new Claims 57-58, which depend directly or indirectly from Claim 24, and should be examined with what the Examiner has identified as Invention IV.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's allegation that the application


should be separated into ten distinct inventions. Applicant submits that what the Examiner has alleged as separate inventions I and II should be certainly included with what the Examiner has identified as Invention IV. Each of the alleged separate inventions, I, II, and IV relate to an improved aircraft and passenger handling system and components thereof, which improve the efficiency, safety, and comfort for both the airline and the passengers. Applicant further submits that the instant application, as a whole, describes and claims an improved airport system. By definition, a system comprises of many components that work in concert to create the system. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asks that the Examiner reconsider the instant restriction requirement.

Conclusion

In light of the above restriction election, with traverse, and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the application now stands in formal condition for allowance and courteously ask for this application be advanced to issue. The Applicant is of the opinion that no additional are required with the submission of this response. However, if additional fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby respectfully authorized to deduct such fees from Deposit Account Number 13-2166. The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative, Taras P. Bemko, at 713-355-4200, to discuss any matters, that may arise, where such discussion may resolve such matters and place this application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date May 23, 2006



Taras P. Bemko.
Registration No. 52,609
The Matthews Firm (Customer # 021897)
2000 Bering, Ste. 700
Houston, Texas 77057
(713) 355-4200 - Telephone
(713) 355-9689 - Facsimile